

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 078

CG 000 238

USING PERSONALITY MEASURES WITH COLLEGE STUDENTS.

BY- GRIENECKS, LAURABETH

PUB DATE MAR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$0.60 15P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COLLEGE STUDENTS, BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS, *STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS, SUBCULTURE, PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST, CLARK TROW RATINGS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, DALLAS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS CONDUCTED A STUDY TO DETERMINE IF DIFFERENT BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS APPEAR AMONG DIFFERENT TYPES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS--THE COLLEGIATE WHO PURSUES FUN, THE SKILL SEEKING VOCATIONAL STUDENT, THE KNOWLEDGE-FOR-ITS-OWN-SAKE ACADEMIC STUDENT, AND THE IDENTITY-CONSCIOUS NONCONFORMIST. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA, THE SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST (SAT) VERBAL AND MATH SCORES, CLARK-TROW RATINGS, AND GRADE POINT AVERAGES WERE AVAILABLE FOR THE SUBJECTS USED. MALE ACADEMIC STUDENTS WERE FOUND TO HAVE HIGHER GRADE POINT AVERAGES AND SAT VERBAL AND MATH SCORES THAN STUDENTS WITH VOCATIONAL, COLLEGIATE, OR NONCONFORMIST ORIENTATION. THE RESULTS SHOWED--(1) MORE ACADEMICS RECEIVED SCHOLARSHIPS, (2) PARENTS OF THE VOCATIONAL STUDENT HAD LESS FORMAL EDUCATION THAN OTHER PARENTS, (3) MORE VOCATIONAL STUDENTS WERE WORKING TOWARDS DOCTORATES, MORE COLLEGIATES TOWARD A LAW DEGREE, AND THE NONCONFORMIST GROUP DID NOT KNOW WHAT DEGREE THEY WERE GOING TO WORK ON, AND (4) MORE VOCATIONALS LIVED IN APARTMENTS WHILE MORE COLLEGIATES LIVED IN THE DORM. FROM THIS DATA, DEFINITIVE STATEMENTS CANNOT BE MADE ABOUT THE STUDENTS AT THIS UNIVERSITY. MORE DIFFERENTIATING DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND LESS PROVINCIAL SUBJECTS NEED TO BE CHOSEN. HOWEVER, WHEN USED TO COMPARE STUDENT ORIENTATION ON SEVERAL CAMPUSES, THE CLARK-TROW RATING SCALE HAS PROVED VALUABLE. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION (DALLAS, MARCH 21, 1967). (VL)

USING PERSONALITY MEASURES WITH COLLEGE STUDENTS*

Laurabeth Grieneeks

Testing and Counseling Center

The University of Texas

When we think of using personality measures with college students such measures as the CPI, MMPI, OPI, OAS or Myers Briggs Type Indicator come to mind. These instruments measure various variables which are often times difficult to define. Since the meaning of personality is influenced by the way it is studied, I would like at this time to extend the definition of personality to include broad behavioral orientations or types.

The history of typologies of college students is short but increasingly eventful. During the late 1950's several grew out of intensive study of a group of students at one particular institution. At Vassar, Freedman and Brown each proposed a typology. Steinzor at Sara Lawrence, Wedge at Yale and Heath at Princeton each developed a classification system. Several contributions to the recent volume The American College, Bereiter and Freeman and Stern also proposed typologies. Looking into these typologies one can see that each differs according to the purpose and perspective of the investigator constructing the model; some reflect the concerns of clinical psychology, and mental health. Today I would like to suggest that we look at a student's orientation toward higher education.

Clark and Trow have suggested a model which is interested more in the impact of the college on the student than any other aspect. This impact is emphasized through the action and influence of peer groups. The four orientations

are divided on two variables (a) the degree to which the student is involved with ideas, and (b) the extent to which students identify with their college. These two variables are then dichotomized. The four orientations which emerge are academic, nonconformist, vocational, and collegiate. These are depicted in the following chart.

A brief description of these four groups can be made by identifying what is the chief pursuit of each orientation and the symbol that might represent each. The collegiate pursues fun and can be characterized by football and fraternity weekends. The vocationally oriented student seeks skills and regards college as a means to a better job. He is often symbolized by the student employment office. Academically oriented students pursue knowledge for knowledge's sake. The library and the laboratory are their symbols. The nonconformist pursues identity and can be identified by distinctive style of dress, speech, and/or attitude.

At this time it might be well to make a distinction drawn by Clark and Trow. They distinguish between student orientation toward college that are held by individual students, and student subcultures which become group norms which constitutes right action and attitude toward a range of issues and experiences confronted in college. Both authors explain, "we can distinguish four broad patterns of orientation toward college which give content and meaning to the informal relations of students. When these patterns of orientation define patterns of behavior, sentiment and relationships we can usefully think of them as subcultures" (Trow, 1961, P.205). "An individual student may well participate in more than one of the subcultures available on his campus, though in most

cases one of them will embody his dominant orientation-will be, so to speak, his normative home on campus. These subcultures are fluid systems of norms and values which overlap and flow into one another on any particular campus in ways that challenge the effort to distinguish them analytically." (Trow, 1962, pp. 208-209).

This paper deals only with "student orientation" (toward higher education); it has to do with a typology of college students (not a typology of student subcultures).

Subjects

Subjects for the study were members of the 1965-66 freshman class at The University of Texas on whom CEEB SAT Verbal and Math scores, first semester grade point averages, and Clark-Trow rankings were available. 2559 students, 1488 males and 1071 females participated. Of this group 2259 students, 1336 males and 923 females also had demographic data.

Procedure and data analysis

The instrument as described above is made up of four philosophies of higher education a student might have. The students were instructed to rank the four statements labeled "personal philosophies of higher education" in the order that they reflected their own philosophy of education. These statements were designed to communicate the essence of each type of orientation in a quick and understandable manner (average, length four sentences). Using only the number one rankings Chi squares were computed for subcultures by sex, and subcultures by demographic variable.

At The University of Texas the overall orientation of college students is

to the Collegiate orientation. Fifty one per cent identified this orientation as their first choice. Vocational and Academic orientation each were selected 23% of time and 3% of the students chose nonconformist as their first choice.

Our interest is to see if broad behavioral patterns do appear among these four orientation. Are there differences in grades and ability levels? Secondly, through the use of demographic information such as place of residence, degree sought, scholarship recipients, and educational level of parents can distinctive characteristics be ferreted out.

As would be expected both academically oriented males and females have significantly higher grade point averages and SAT Verbal scores than those students with vocational or collegiate orientations. The male academics also have higher SAT Verbal scores than those with nonconformist orientation. Both male and female nonconformist have higher SAT Verbal scores than the students of collegiate or vocational orientation. The females show no difference in the four orientation on SAT Math but male academics again have higher Math scores than either the vocational or collegiate type.

On demographic information some differences are noted. These are not as extensive or as definitive as would be desired but they are possible indications for some broad behavioral patterns.

Again as might be expected significantly more academically oriented students are scholarship recipients. On educational level of parents, fathers of vocationally oriented students were represented significantly fewer times as having professional degrees. There seems to be a trend for the fathers of these vocationally oriented

to have a higher number completing elementary school, higher number having some high school, and a fewer number having more than four years of college. For the educational level of mothers, of these same students, the vocationally oriented, more mothers have no formal education. Fewer mothers have college degrees. The trend seemed to indicate that more had not completed elementary school and more had completed elementary school. The only showing for collegiate orientation was a possible trend that more of these mothers complete elementary school. Nothing stood out for either the mothers or fathers of academically oriented or nonconformist types.

From this data it seems that the vocationally oriented student has parents who have had less formal education than the other groups.

In looking at the degree the student is working toward, more vocational students were working toward doctorates. Also more of these students were not working toward a degree. It would be assumed that these students would have a particular occupational goal and be working directly toward it, but from this data this does not seem to be the case.

More collegiates are working toward a law degree. This might be predicted because the fraternity group makes up this orientation and additional education toward a law degree is an accepted goal for these students. It is not surprising to discover that the nonconformist group do not know what degree they are going to work on. This might be because they have broad sphere of interest, which makes it difficult to limit their interests to a specific area to do concentrated work in order to obtain a degree.

Places of residence also produced some interesting differences. There seems to be a mirror difference between vocational and collegiate groupings. Fewer vocationally oriented students live in dorms than do collegiates. On the other hand, fewer collegiates live in apartments while more vocationals do. There seems to be a trend toward more vocational oriented students living with parents with less collegiates living at home. This could possibly be explained by the fact that identification with college and the "rah-rah" fun are connected with group living and these students wish to be in the "thick" of things while the vocationally oriented student is interested in getting the degree; therefore, he puts all else aside to attain his goal. Secondly, he may lack the financial resources needed to be an active participant in the collegiate culture.

More academics live at home than would be expected and more of this orientation did not know where they were going to live when they filled out the statistical questionnaire. More students of nonconformist orientation lived in single rooms. This could be anticipated because these students are seeking an identity and seeking independence. Where better to get it than by living alone and not having to report your whereabouts to anyone.

The number of hours a student worked per week, marital status, access to car and loan recipients were data which provided no differentiation in the four groups.

From this data it is not possible to make definitive statements about the students at The University of Texas. At this time this instrument may not be valuable for showing differences between the four orientations at Texas because

we have not selected the correct demographic variables to investigate. Secondly, the size of the freshman class and the fact that they are mostly Texas high school graduates may suggest that they have all received similar influences and developed like attitudes during their high school years. On the other hand this instrument does seem to be of value when used to compare several campuses. This was evidenced by the work as yet unpublished by Peterson. Each school may have a distinct ordering of orientation, and this could influence a student's adjustment and success in school.

Since only tentative validation is possible from the differences found in the demographic information, plans are in process to continue to study Trow : classifications through using factor analysis with items that tap personality variables. Secondly, we want to study behavior of each group through a group process situation.

REFERENCES

1. Bereiter and Freedman, M. B. Field of study and the people in them. In Sanford, N. (Ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 563-596.
2. Brown, D. Some educational patterns. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12(4), 44-60.
3. Clark, B. R. Educating the expert society. San Francisco, Calif: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
4. Freedman, M. B. The passage through college. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12(4), 13-28.
5. Heath, R. The reasonable adventurer. A study of the development of thirty-six undergraduates at Princeton. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
6. Sanford, N. (Ed.) The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.
7. Steinzor, B. The development of intellectual qualities through the college years. In Murphy, L. B. and Raushenbush, E. (Eds.), Achievement in the College Years: A record of intellectual and personal growth. New York: Harper, 1960.
8. Stein, G. G. Environments for learning. In Sanford, N. (Ed.). The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.
9. Trow, M. Student subcultures and administrative action. In R. L. Sutherland et al. (Ed.) Personality factors on the college campus. Austin, Texas: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.
10. Trow, M. The campus viewed as a culture. In Research on college students. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.
11. Trow, M. Cultural sophistication and higher education. In Selection and educational differentiation. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Field Service Center and Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1959.
12. Wedge, B. M. (Ed.). Psychosocial problems of college men. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Using Personality Measures with College Students
Laurabeth Grieneeks

Table 1

Degree of student involvement with ideas and identification with college			
Identify with College	Involved with ideas		
	High		Low
	High	Academic	Collegiate
	Low	Non Conformist	Vocational

Table 2

Division of student subcultures, their pursuits, and symbols		
Subculture	Pursuit	Symbol
Collegiate	Fun	Football and fraternity weekends
Vocational	Skills and a diploma	Student placement office
Academic	Knowledge	Library and laboratories
Non conformist	Identity	Distinctive style dress, speech, attitude

Using Personality Measures with College Students :
Laurabeth Grieneeks

Demographic Items Which Contained Significant Difference Among Orientations

Content and Alternative	<u>Percent in Type</u>				
	N	Vocational	Academic	Collegiate	Non-Confor.
Students receiving Scholarship	256	22	29 ^a	47	1
Highest level of education reached by father					
Graduate or professional degree	365	16 ^a	23	55	4
Completed elementary school	66	33 ^b	21	42	3
Some high school, did not graduate	199	29 ^b	24	44	2
More than 4 years college, no higher degree	133	15 ^b	30 ^b	52	2
Highest level of education reached by mother					
No formal education	5	80 ^a	20	0	0
Did not complete elementary school	23	39 ^b	30	30	0
Completed elementary school	26	42 ^b	26	26 ^b	4
College graduate	314	17 ^a	24	55	3
Type of housing					
Dormitory	1091	19 ^a	21	57 ^a	2
Rooming house	209	24	24	45	7 ^a
Apartment	112	37 ^a	26	34 ^a	0
With parents or relatives	295	28 ^b	26 ^a	43 ^b	2
Don't know yet	26	19	46 ^a	34	0
Degree working toward					
Doctor's	47	36 ^a	26	36	2
Bachelor of Law	51	15	69	15 ^a	0
Don't know	202	22	17	54	5 ^a
None	27	48 ^a	15	37	0

^a Significant .05

^b Trend toward significance less than .10

Using Personality Measures with College Students
Laurabeth Grieneeks

Freshman 1965
The University of Texas
Divided by Trow Classifications and Sex

	Vocational		Academic		Collegiate		Non-Conformist	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
GPA-Mean	399	186	327	267	706	587	56	31
SD	1.36	1.44	1.63	1.74	1.35	1.49	1.47	1.44
	.75	.67	.76	.69	.73	.70	.69	.83
SAT-Verbal Mean	537	525	565	571	530	532	596	577
SD	84	80	89	89	83	79	90	87
SAT-Math Mean	588	520	610	552	588	529	596	551
SD	82	82	87	90	83	79	83	90

t tests that were significant:

Variable	Classification	t	Variable	Classification	t
Females GPA	Academic-Vocational	4.62	Males SAT-Verbal	Academic-Vocational	4.32
"	Academic-Collegiate	4.90	"	Academic-Collegiate	5.59
Males GPA	Academic-Vocational	4.74	"	Non Conformist-Academic	2.38
"	Academic-Collegiate	5.60	"	Non Conformist-Vocational	4.65
Females SAT-Verbal	Academic-Collegiate	5.72	"	Non Conformist-Collegiate	4.32
"	Academic-Collegiate	6.13	Males SAT-Math	Academic-Collegiate	3.47
"	Non Conformist-Vocational	3.13	"		
"	Non Conformist-Collegiate	2.83	"		

On every college or university campus students hold a variety of attitudes about their own purposes and goals while at college. Such an attitude might be thought of as a personal philosophy of higher education. Below are descriptive statements of four such "personal philosophies" which there is reason to believe are quite prevalent on American college campuses. As you read the four statements, attempt to determine how close each comes to your own philosophy of higher education.

PHILOSOPHY A: This philosophy emphasizes education essentially as preparation for an occupational future. Social or purely intellectual phases of campus life are relatively less important, though certainly not ignored. Concern with extracurricular activities and college traditions is relatively small. Persons holding this philosophy are usually quite committed to particular fields of study and are in college primarily to obtain training for careers in their chosen fields.

PHILOSOPHY B: This philosophy, while it does not ignore career preparation, assigns greatest importance to scholarly pursuit of knowledge and understanding wherever the pursuit may lead. This philosophy entails serious involvement in course work or independent study beyond the minimum required. Social life and organized extracurricular activities are relatively unimportant. Thus, while other aspects of college life are not to be forsaken, this philosophy attaches greatest importance to interest in ideas, pursuit of knowledge, and cultivation of the intellect.

PHILOSOPHY C: This philosophy holds that besides occupational training and/or scholarly endeavor an important part of college life exists outside the classroom, laboratory and library. Extracurricular activities, living-group functions, athletics, social life, rewarding friendships, and loyalty to college traditions are important elements in one's college experience and necessary to the cultivation of the well-rounded person. Thus, while not excluding academic activities, this philosophy emphasizes the importance of the extracurricular side of college life.

PHILOSOPHY D: This is a philosophy held by the student who either consciously rejects commonly held value orientations in favor of his own, or who has not really decided what is to be valued and is in a sense searching for meaning in life. There is often deep involvement with ideas and art forms both in the classroom and in sources (often highly original and individualistic) in the wider society. There is little interest in business or professional careers; in fact, there may be a definite rejection of this kind of aspiration. Many facts of the college - organized extracurricular activities, athletics, traditions, the college administration - are ignored or viewed with disdain. In sort, this philosophy may emphasize individualistic interests and styles, concern for personal identity, and, often, contempt for many aspects of organized society.

The following four questions ask you to rank these four statements according to the accuracy with which each portrays your own point of view. Be sure to assign a different rank to each "philosophy."

1. Philosophy A:

1. Most accurate (i.e., of the four statements, this one is the best description of my point of view)
2. Second most accurate
3. Third most accurate
4. Least accurate

2. Philosophy B:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

3. Philosophy C:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

4. Philosophy D:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

REFERENCES

- Clark, B. R. College image and student selection. In Field Service Center and Center for the Study of Higher Education. Selection and educational differentiation. Berkeley: University of California, 1959.
- Clark, B. R. Educating the expert society. San Francisco, Calif: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
- Trow, M. Cultural sophistication and higher education. In Selection and educational differentiation. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Field Service Center and Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1959.
- Trow, M. The campus viewed as a culture. In Research on college students. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.
- Trow, M. Student subcultures and administrative action. In R. L. Sutherland et al. (Ed.) Personality factors on the college campus. Austin, Texas: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1962.

For further information: Laurabeth Grieneeks
Testing and Counseling Center
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712